



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,061	11/17/2003	Jim C. Ta	119166.001034 (50-03-038)	7028
38851	7590	07/13/2007	EXAMINER	
Law Office of Stephen R. Loe P.O. Box 649 Frisco, TX 75034			WU, JUNCHUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center"><b>Office Action Summary</b></p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>10/715,061</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>TA, JIM C.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Junchun Wu</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2191</p>	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-17, 19-30 and 32-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-17, 19-30 and 32-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on April 30, 2007.
2. Claims 1,2,10,14,15,23,24,27,28,36 and 37 have been amended.
3. Claims 5,18 and 31 have been cancelled.
4. No new claims have been added.
5. Claims 1-4,6-17,19-30 and 32-39 are pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 12-17, 19-22, 25-30, 32-35, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capossela et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,642 hereafter "Capossela"), and in view of Almond et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,024 hereafter "Almond").

8. (Currently Amended) For claims 1,14, and 27, Capossela teaches  
A method for controlling code in a multi-developer software development environment (col.2 lines 10-12), the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2191

- receiving a request from a requesting user to check out a software component (col.7 lines 36-41).
- tagging the software component as non-modifiable by the requesting user and preventing modification to the software component by the requesting user (col.6 lines 1-3 & col.7 lines 55-58; when the software component showed 'check out' in visual SourceSafe, that object is not allow to edit, modify or rename from users).
- determining whether the software component has been checked out by another user (col.7 lines 55-58; similar function as RequestModifyObject, one of the variables which is pbCancel set to true if the object has been checked out).

But Capossela does not teach

- untagging the software component, providing the requesting user with a modifiable copy of the software component, and receiving a description of changes intended to be made by the requesting user if the software component has not been checked out by another user.

However Almond teaches

- untagging the software component, providing the requesting user with a modifiable copy of the software component, and receiving a description of changes intended to be made by the requesting user if the software component has not been checked out by another user (col.43 lines 20-32 & col.44 lines 33-44 e.g. *"getting copies of objects from ObjectCycle to the user's file system when the user needs to verify their contents or start versioning them"* & in step 6 *"take a look at the information that ObjectCycle has stored*

Art Unit: 2191

*about the brief history of the user's object" & in step 7 "select the object, right-click and select properties from the object view popup menu..."*).

- Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Capossela's teachings by untagging the software component, providing the requesting user with a modifiable copy of the software component, and receiving a description of changes intended to be made by the requesting user if the software component has not been checked out by another user as taught by Almond in order to provide the user performs version control activities so that user can do their development work most effectively (Almond, col.43 lines 12-15).

9. (Currently Amended) For claims 2,15, and 28, Capossela teaches

- presenting the requesting user with an indication that the software component has been checked out by another user and is not available for modification if the software component has been checked out by another user (col.8 lines 1-8).

10. (Original) For claims 3,16, and 29, Capossela teaches

- creating a backup copy of the software component prior to providing the user with a modifiable copy of the software component (col.5 lines 52-59).

11. (Original) For claims 4,17, and 30, Capossela does not disclose

Art Unit: 2191

- updating a file indicating that the software component is checked out, the identity of the user that checked out the software component, the date the software component was checked out, and the time the software component was checked out.

But Almond teaches

- updating a file indicating that the software component is checked out, the identity of the user that checked out the software component, the date the software component was checked out, and the time the software component was checked out (col.44 lines 22-25).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Capossela's teachings by updating a file indicating that the software component is checked out, the identity of the user that checked out the software component, the date the software component was checked out, and the time the software component was checked out as taught by Almond in order to let users to view the status of the objects before they perform any actions (Almond, col.44 lines 24-25).

12. (Original) For claims 6,19, and 32, Capossela teaches

- updating a file indicating the changes intended be made to the software component (col.1 lines 35-40).

13. (Original) For claims 7,20, and 33, Capossela teaches

- the software component is an object (This is a well-known concept in object-oriented technologies. The terms "component" and "object" are often used synonymously).

Art Unit: 2191

14. (Original) For claims 8,21, and 34, Capossela teaches
  - the method as recited in claim 4, wherein the file is one of a table and a database (col.1 lines 41-46).
15. (Original) For claims 9,22, and 35, Capossela teaches
  - the method as recited in claim 6, wherein the file is one of a table and a database (col.1 lines 41-46).
16. (Original) For claims 12,25, and 38, Capossela teaches
  - determining that the requesting user requests to check the software component back in (col.5 lines 60-64);
  - saving an updated software component, indicating that the software component is checked in, and indicating that the software component is not modifiable (col.8 lines 48-54),

But Capossela dose not teach

- prompting the requesting user to enter a description of what has changed to the software component.

However, Almond teaches

- prompting the requesting user to enter a description of what has changed to the software component (col.45 lines 13-15).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Capossela's teachings by prompting the requesting user to

Art Unit: 2191

enter a description of what has changed to the software component as taught by Almond in order to provide the information so that the user's team member know which objects had been changed and what has changed to the objects by users (col.44 lines 22-25).

17. (Original) For claims 13, 26, and 39, Almond teaches

- updating a file indicating that the software component is checked back in, the date and time checked in, the identity of the developer who checked the software component back in, and the nature of the changes made to the software component (Almond, col.44 lines 22-27).

18. Claims 10, 11, 23, 24, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capossela, in view of Almond and in further view of Miller et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20040088647 thereafter "Miller").

19. (Currently Amended) For claims 10, 23, and 36,

Both Capossela and Almond do not disclose

- determining whether the requesting user wishes to send a message to the user who currently has the software component checked out; prompting the requesting user to indicate the message to be sent to the user who currently has the software component checked out; and sending the message to the user who currently has the software component checked out.

But Miller teach



Art Unit: 2191

- determining whether the requesting user wishes to send a message to the user who currently has the object checked out; and sending the message to the user who currently has the software component checked out (0049; 0050 lines 9-12; email notifications may be manually used by each use while users desired to check in or check out objects.); and prompting the requesting user to indicate the message to be sent to the user who currently has the software component checked out (0039 lines 13-16).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Capossela and the teachings of Almond, and with the teachings of Miller by determining whether the requesting user wishes to send a message to the user who currently has the object checked out; prompting the requesting user to indicate the message to be sent to the user who currently has the software component checked out; and sending the message to the user who currently has the software component checked out.
- The motivation is that in a multi-user software development environment, the version control or file processing system apparently become very critical. Each user has a different permission or privilege level to check in/check out objects. Thus, by using an email message or sending a notification, users would know the availability of the files and status of the files in the a shared workspace environment (Miller, 0012)

20. (Original) For claims 11, 24, and 37, the rejection of claims 10, 23, and 36 are incorporated respectively, Miller further teaches

Art Unit: 2191

- determining the method the requesting user wished the message to be sent to the user who currently has the software component checked out; and sending the message by the method specified by the requesting user (0049; 0050 lines 9-12; email notifications may be manually used by each use while users desired to check in or check out objects.).

Claims 1-4,6-17,19-30 and 32-39 are pending in the application and which have been fully considered by examiner.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejection have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junchun Wu whose telephone number is 571-270-1250. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-17:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.<sup>1</sup>

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JW



WEI ZHEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER